

## United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.    | FILING DATE    | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO.        |  |  |
|--------------------|----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|--|
| 09/692,435         | 10/19/2000     | Mark Olijnyk         | BRI-00027               | 6193                    |  |  |
| 7                  | 590 07/30/2002 |                      |                         |                         |  |  |
| Warn IP Law Office |                |                      | EXAM                    | EXAMINER                |  |  |
| P O Box 70098      |                |                      | POPPIGON MARKA          |                         |  |  |
| Rochester Hlls,    | , MI 48307     |                      | ROBINSON, MARK A        |                         |  |  |
|                    |                |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER            |  |  |
|                    |                |                      | 2872                    |                         |  |  |
|                    |                |                      | DATE MAILED: 07/30/2002 | DATE MAILED: 07/30/2002 |  |  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| •  |  |  | RU                                      |
|--|--|--|---|
|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)   |   |
| Advisory Action  | 09/692,435   | OLIJNYK ET AL.   |   |
| , i.e., j., i.e., e.,  | Examiner   | Art Unit   |   |
|  | Mark A. Robinson   | 2872   |   |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app   | ears on the cover sheet wit  | th the correspondence addi   | ress                                    |
| THE REPLY FILED 15 July 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Apple Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.  | avoid abandonment of this (1) a timely filed amendment                     | s application. A proper repent which places the application.                   | oly to a cation in                      |
| PERIOD FOR R   | <u>EPLY</u> [check either a) or b  | )]   |   |
| a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date   | ·  |  |   |
| b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Acevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The descriptions.   | than SIX MONTHS from the mailin<br>S FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS               | ng date of the final rejection.<br>S OF THE FINAL REJECTION. S                 | See MPEP                                |
| have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extermining the period of the shortene (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three mearned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | nsion and the corresponding amou<br>ed statutory period for reply original | unt of the fee. The appropriate extending set in the final Office action; or ( | ension fee under<br>(2) as set forth in |
| 1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF  |  |  |   |
| 2. $\boxtimes$ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered $\vdash$  | because:   |  |   |
| (a) 🛛 they raise new issues that would require furth   | her consideration and/or se  | earch (see NOTE below);  |   |
| (b) \( \square\) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note  | below);  |  |   |
| <ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application<br/>issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>  | in better form for appeal t  | by materially reducing or s  | implifying the                          |
| (d) they present additional claims without cance   | eling a corresponding num  | ber of finally rejected clain  | ns.                                     |
| NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.  |  |  |   |
| 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection.   | ction(s):  |  |   |
| 4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  | d be allowable if submitted  | I in a separate, timely filed  | i amendment                             |
| 5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: _   |  | n considered but does NC   | T place the                             |
| 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.   | ecause it is not directed SC   | DLELY to issues which we   | re newly                                |
| 7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims v  |  |  | and an                                  |
| The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows  | <b>5</b> :   |  |   |
| Claim(s) allowed:  |  |  |   |
| Claim(s) objected to:  |  |  |   |
| Claim(s) rejected:   |  |  |   |
| Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:   |  |  |   |
| 8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is   | s a) approved or b)  | disapproved by the Exam  | iner.                                   |
| 9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme  | ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper N  | √o(s)  |   |
| 10.⊠ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>  | × ×  | Mark Robinson  |   |
|  |  | Primary Examiner<br>Art Unit 2872  |   |

Application No.



("which provides for") does not have the same meaning or scope as the language added to the claim ("operably").

Continuation of 2. NOTE: the proposed amendments would require further consideration--e.g. the language deleted from claim 1

Continuation of 10. Other: Regarding applicant's remarks concerning withdrawal of the finality of the office action, it should be noted that the examiner cannot anticipate the claiming of every possible feature or combination of features found in the specification. Regarding the remarks concerning claim 10, applicant is reminded that a "dependent" claim is merely a shorthand form for writing a claim. Thus, the statement that claim 10 was not amended is incorrect since this claim was amended by virtue of the amendment to parent claim 1.